UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/882,874	06/15/2001	Mark J. Marlow	SRT-026	9584

21323 7590 03/01/2005

TESTA, HURWITZ & THIBEAULT, LLP
HIGH STREET TOWER
125 HIGH STREET
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER	
ROCHE, TRENTON J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2124	

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/882,874	MARLOW, MARK J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Trent J Roche	2124	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 October 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 June 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to communications filed 4 October 2004.

2. Per applicant's request, amended claims 1, 8, 11, 19 and 20 have been entered. Claims 1-20 are now pending.

3. Claims 1-20 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-16, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,275,978 to Bell.

Regarding claim 1:

Bell teaches:

- a method for generating a binary object in a computer system ("generates data files to assist in the localization..." in col. 3 line 67 to col. 4 line 1)
- including a local site in communications with a remote site ("to send to or receive from another computer system on a computer network..." in col. 6 lines 32-33)

- receiving information at a local site from a remote site ("downloaded from a source computer to a destination computer..." in col. 6 lines 55-56)
- transforming the received information into an executable binary object adapted to transform a data value in a first representation to a data value in a second representation ("the program compiler generates a program object code, which can be a machine code that can be directly executed by the processor" in col. 6 lines 15-17. Further, "The resource program file and resource bundle program file are embedded within the program object code...to provide term localization differentiation during execution of the program object code..." in col. 4 lines 17-21.)
- applying said binary object to transform the data value from the first representation to the second representation ("data files to assist in the localization differentiation of source data values" in col. 4 lines 1-2. Further, "The resource program file and resource bundle program file are embedded within the program object code...to provide term localization differentiation during execution of the program object code..." in col. 4 lines 17-21.)

substantially as claimed.

Regarding claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Bell discloses storing said binary object at a local site as claimed (Note Figure 1, item 68 and the corresponding section of the disclosure. The generated object code is stored in local system memory.)

Regarding claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Bell discloses a method for converting a coordinated universal time (UTC) value into a localized time value as claimed ("generates data files to assist in the localization..." in col. 3 line 67 to col. 4 line 1. Further, Bell discloses that it was well known that the Java programming language provides classes for the localization of dates and times, as the "'data format class', along with 'calendar' and 'time zone' classes from the Java utility package, are used to display dates and times in a localized specific way" in col. 1 lines 25-35. The java Calendar class provides UTC to local time translation, therefore, the system of Bell inherently provides a method for converting a UTC value into a localized time value.)

Regarding claim 4:

The rejection of claim 3 is incorporated, and further, Bell discloses receiving a coordinated universal time (UTC) value, converting said UTC value to a localized time value, and providing said localized time value as claimed ("during execution of the object program, the resource bundle program file...is accessed to provide term localization..." in col. 6 lines 19-20. Further, as indicated in the rejection of claim 3, the ability to convert from a UTC value to a localized time value is inherently present in the system disclosed by Bell.)

Regarding claim 5:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Bell discloses a method for converting a localized time value into a coordinated universal time (UTC) value as claimed ("generates data files to assist in the localization..." in col. 3 line 67 to col. 4 line 1. Further, Bell discloses that it was well known that the Java programming language provides classes for the localization of dates and times, as the "'data format class', along with 'calendar' and 'time zone' classes from the Java utility package,

are used to display dates and times in a localized specific way" in col. 1 lines 25-35. The java Calendar class provides local time to UTC translation, therefore, the system of Bell inherently provides a method for converting a local time value to a UTC value.)

Regarding claim 6:

The rejection of claim 3 is incorporated, and further, Bell discloses receiving a localized time value, converting said localized time value to a coordinated universal time (UTC) value, and providing said UTC value as claimed ("during execution of the object program, the resource bundle program file...is accessed to provide term localization..." in col. 6 lines 19-20. Further, as indicated in the rejection of claim 5, the ability to convert from a localized time value to a UTC value is inherently present in the system disclosed by Bell.)

Regarding claim 7:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Bell discloses converting information into a source code file, and compiling the source code file into a binary object as claimed (Note Figure 2 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure. The information is represented at source code, and then compiled into object code.)

Regarding claim 8:

Bell teaches:

- a method for generating a binary object in a computer system ("generates data files to assist in the localization..." in col. 3 line 67 to col. 4 line 1)

- including a local site in communications with a remote site ("to send to or receive from another computer system on a computer network..." in col. 6 lines 32-33)
- receiving information at a local site from a remote site, said information including localization information ("downloaded from a source computer to a destination computer..." in col. 6 lines 55-56. Further, this information may be "one or a combination of the following:...the resource bundle file...the localized and localized differentiated messages as defined and provided in the resource bundle program file..." in col. 6 lines 35-49)
- transforming the received information into an executable binary object adapted to transform a data value in a first representation to a data value in a second representation ("the program compiler generates a program object code, which can be a machine code that can be directly executed by the processor" in col. 6 lines 15-17. Further, "The resource program file and resource bundle program file are embedded within the program object code...to provide term localization differentiation during execution of the program object code..." in col. 4 lines 17-21.)

substantially as claimed.

Regarding claim 9:

The rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and further, Bell discloses localization information describing the relationship between coordinated universal time (UTC) and a localized time, and information describing scheduled clock adjustments as claimed ("the localized and localized differentiated messages as defined and provided in the resource bundle program file..." in col. 6 47-49)

Regarding claim 10:

The rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and further, note the rejection regarding claim.3.

Regarding claim 11:

The rejection of claim 10 is incorporated, and further, note the rejection regarding claim 4

Regarding claim 12:

The rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and further, note the rejection regarding claim 5

Regarding claim 13:

The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated, and further, note the rejection regarding claim 6.

Regarding claim 14:

The rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and further, Bell discloses applying the binary object to information received through a connection between said local site and remote site as claimed ("the message translation call to the resource bundle program file would proceed back to the source computer..." in col. 6 lines 58-60)

Regarding claim 15:

The rejection of claim 14 is incorporated, and further, Bell discloses information including a localized time value ("and 'time zone' classes...are used to display dates and times in a localized specific way" in col. 1 lines 35-36)

Regarding claim 16:

The rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and further, note the rejection of claim 7.

Regarding claim 19:

Bell teaches:

- a system for providing automated localization of data sets ("generates data files to assist in the localization..." in col. 3 line 67 to col. 4 line 1)
- a remote site and a local site ("to send to or receive from another computer system on a computer network..." in col. 6 lines 32-33)
- a computer comprising a binary object, said binary object comprised a method for time conversion ("generates data files to assist in the localization..." in col. 3 line 67 to col. 4 line 1. Further, the time data was well known at the time of the invention to be a part of localization, as indicated in col. 1 lines 28-29, "a program to localize the handling of numbers, dates, times...")
- a communications module, said communications module providing telecommunications between said remote site and said local site ("modem/network interface card can be utilized to send to or receive from another computer system on a computer network..." in col. 6 lines 31-33)
- wherein said remote site provides a record comprising a data entry comprising a time value in a first representation to said local site using said communications module and said binary object converts said data entry from the first representation to a second representation ("the message translation call to the resource bundle program file would proceed back to the

source computer..." in col. 6 lines 58-60. "The program compiler generates a program object code, which can be a machine code that can be directly executed by the processor" in col. 6 lines 15-17. Further, "The resource program file and resource bundle program file are embedded within the program object code...to provide term localization differentiation during execution of the program object code..." in col. 4 lines 17-21.)

substantially as claimed.

Regarding claim 20:

Bell teaches:

- a method for facilitating automated localization of data sets ("generates data files to assist in the localization..." in col. 3 line 67 to col. 4 line 1)
- in a computer system including a local site and a remote site ("to send to or receive from another computer system on a computer network..." in col. 6 lines 32-33)
- providing a connection between said local site and said remote site ("to send to or receive from another computer system on a computer network..." in col. 6 lines 32-33)
- receiving information at said local site from said remote site, said information including a first time value ("downloaded from a source computer to a destination computer...the message translation call to the resource bundle program file would proceed back to the source computer..." in col. 6 lines 55-60. Further, the translation is intended for the localization of data, and time data was well known at the time of the invention to be a part of localization, as indicated in col. 1 lines 28-29, "a program to localize the handling of numbers, dates, times...")

- applying a transformation to said received information, said transformation converting said time value from a first representation to a second representation; and providing said time value in said second representation ("during execution of the object program, the resource bundle program file...is accessed to provide term localization..." in col. 6 lines 19-20.)

substantially as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,275,978 to Bell in view of U.S. Patent 6,370,566 to Discolo et al, hereafter referred to as Discolo.

Regarding claim 17:

The rejection of claim 16 is incorporated, and further, Bell does not explicitly disclose the source code file being a Visual Basic file. Discolo discloses in an analogous localization time-stamping system the use of Visual Basic ("for use in Visual Basic..." in col. 12 line 58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as this would enable the use of COM objects in the system disclosed by Bell, providing convenient automation interfaces as discloses in col. 12 lines 57-58.

Regarding claim 18:

The rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and further, Bell does not explicitly disclose the binary object being a component object model (COM) dynamically-linked library (DLL). Discolo discloses in an analogous localization time-stamping system the use of COM ("is a component object model based (COM-based) set of interfaces..." in col. 12 lines 55-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use COM objects in the system disclosed by Bell, as that "methods or functions can be called form other software components..." as stated in col. 10 lines 2-5 of Discolo.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 4 October 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Per claims 1, 8 and 20:

The applicant states that Bell does not teach or suggest the newly added limitations of at least transforming the received information into an executable binary object adapted to transform a data value in a first representation to a data value in a second representation; and applying said binary object to transform the data value from the first representation to the second representation. In response, as noted in the rejection of claim 1, Bell discloses a program compiler generating a program object code containing a resource program file and a resource bundle program file, whereby the files are utilized to provide term localization differentiation during execution. As such, Bell does disclose an executable binary object adapted to transform a data value in a first representation to a data value in a second representation, as the executable file produced by the

compiler is utilized for localization differentiation. Further, the applicant states that Bell does not disclose the above limitations occurring only at a local site. However, the claim language as recited in independent claim 1 does not require that all localization occur solely at the local site; rather, the claim only requires that information be received at a local site from a remote site, of which Bell discloses, and the claim does not recite that the transforming and applying steps of the method must occur at the local site. For these reasons, the rejection of claim 1 is proper and maintained.

Similar limitations are recited in independent claims 8 and 20. For the reasons stated above and in the rejections regarding claims 8 and 20, the rejections of claims 8 and 20 are proper and maintained.

Per claim 19:

The applicant states that Bell does not disclose an executable binary object that locally converts a data entry from a first representation to a second representation. In response, note the rejection of claim 19 and the remarks concerning independent claim 1. As was the case with claim 1, claim 19 does not specifically require that the conversion of the data entry from a first representation to a second representation occur solely on the local site; rather, that the local site receives a data entry, and a binary object on the local site converts said data entry. However, the claim does not dictate or limit that the conversion must occur locally, only that the binary object has a part in the conversion. Bell discloses the execution of the object program for localization differentiation, which sends a request to the source (remote) computer to localize the data. According to the broadest reasonable interpretation, the object program is still converting the data, regardless of whether it is accessing an external system or data file to assist in the conversion. For these reasons, the rejection of claim 19 is proper and maintained.

Per claims 2-7 and 9-18:

The applicant states that claims 2-7 and 9-18 are allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim. As noted above, the rejections of independent claims 1 and 8 are proper and maintained, and as such, the argument that claims 2-7 and 9-18 are allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim is considered moot. The rejections of claims 2-7 and 9-18 are proper and maintained.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trent J Roche whose telephone number is (571)272-3733. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571)272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Trent J Roche
Examiner
Art Unit 2124

TJR

KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100